



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ON SOME OLD ENGLISH GHOST-WORDS.

IN a paper which I read before the Philological Society in London on May 4th, 1894, I pointed out that the O.E. forms *toste* 'frog, toad' (Grein, Hall) and *taxe* 'toad' (Leo, Hall, Sweet, Bosworth-Toller) were incorrect, that there really is only one word, not two, and that the correct form is *tosca*, *toxa*¹ (or possibly fem. *-sce*). Grein cites two instances *tostan* (acc. sg.) Psalm 77^{as}, and *toscean* (acc. pl.) Ps. 104^{as}, and decides for *st*, being apparently led thereto by its supposed relationship to Danish *tudse*. Apart from the fact that the *e* in *toscean*, regular after *sc*, would be inexplicable after *st*, we have independent evidence that *sc* is right. In the Durham Ritual, p. 125, *rana* is rendered by *tosca*, but still stronger evidence is afforded by a gloss in my forthcoming volume of O.E. glosses, I, 1855 *rubete-toxan*, where the *x* can stand by metathesis for *sc*, but not for *st*. This gl. is taken from an Oxford Aldhelm MS. and the same gl. was printed from a Brussels MS. by Bouterwek in the *Zeitschrift für deutsches Alterthum* IX, 450,² where it appears as *rubetætaxan*. This is the source of the *taxe* of the dictionaries. As a matter of fact the Brussels MS. reads *tāxan*,³ i. e. another scribe has added *o* over the line, thus altering *taxan* to *toxan*, and this, together with the reading of the Oxford MS., shows that the word here meant is *toxan*.

In most of the O.E. dictionaries from Somner and Lye down to Sweet we find a word *fornefa*, which the most recent lexicographers render by 'great-grandson.' From Lye and Hall we learn its source, it is a gloss in the Cot-

¹ Meanwhile both Sweet, in his *O.E. Dict.*, and Bosworth-Toller have given the correct *tosca*, but they both retain the incorrect *taxe*.

² In the following notes the glosses printed by Bouterwek are referred to as *Hpt.*

³ Cp. Hausknecht's collation, *Anglia* VI, 100.

tonian MS. Cleopatra A. 3 and may be found printed in Wright-Wülker 465⁴ *Pronepotum-fornefena*. This Cleopatra glossary is to a very great extent derived from Aldhelm's *De laudibus virginitatis*, and if we refer to the passage from which this particular gloss is taken¹ (ed. Giles, p. 23¹⁰), we find it reads, *Sed quid in veteribus viris, quibus priscæ legis licentia nuptiales thalamorum copulas pro nepotum prosapia et posterorum progenie propaganda clementer indulsit*, etc. Thus it becomes evident that Wülker ought to have printed *pro nepotum*=*for nefena*, the *for*, like the *pro*, being a preposition, not a prefix. Hence *fornefa* must be struck out of the dictionaries. Just as little justification is there for the supposed feminine *fornefe* 'a nephew's daughter, proneptis,' which figures in Bosworth-Toller with the references, 'Som., Ben., Lye.' The editors of B.T. have however incorrectly reproduced their authorities: Som., Ben., Lye all have '*fornefa*, *-nefe* "Pronepos,"' and Lye, in addition, gives his source, viz. *Cott. 150*,² so that there is no MS. authority whatever for the supposed fem. *fornefe*.

Indeed one of the most fruitful sources of ghost-words is to be found in the O.E. glosses, and one point that has especially led lexicographers astray is the habit of O.E. glossators of only writing out a portion of the gloss, sometimes the first few letters, sometimes the last, just sufficient to indicate to their O.E. reader what they meant. This is very common in the *Hpt. gll.*³ An instance of error

¹ That the gl. is really taken from this very passage in Aldhelm (p. 23¹⁰) and not from p. 72¹, where the compound *pronepotum* is actually found, is fully proved by the neighbouring glosses, which occur in the text of Aldhelm in the very same order as in the Cleopatra Glossary. To make this clear I give the Latin lemmata from Wright-Wülker 465¹ to 465¹¹, adding in each case the reference to the passage in Aldhelm (ed. Giles) from which it is taken. W. W. 465¹ *portendentes* occurs Giles 22¹⁶; *puberes* G. 22²⁶; *pulmentum* G. 22³⁴; *pro nepotum* G. 23¹¹; *penitudinis* G. 24¹⁶; *paranymphus* G. 24¹⁸; *propalat* G. 27¹⁰; *pastinantem* G. 27¹⁸; *precipuum* G. 28⁴; *pubescens* G. 28³⁰; *pausantis* G. 29³⁷.

² Lye's *Cott. 150* means the same gl. as that printed in W. W. 465⁴.

³ It is common too in the Kentish Gll. edited by Zupitza, *Zeitschrift f. deutsches Altertum* XXI, 18 (and by Wright-Wülker, 55) and in the *Rule of St. Benet*, ed. H. Logeman (cp. p. xl), etc.

arising in this way I pointed out in the *Academy* May 12, 1894, p. 399, viz. *lāc* 'medicine,' which is given by Leo, Bosworth-Toller, Hall, and Sweet. The source of this is to be found in the following gl.: Hpt. 415 *lac*=*medicinæ*; 507 *lac*=*medicamine*; 527 *lac*=*medicamenti*. If however we compare with these Hpt. 478 *cataplasma*=*lacnunge*, it becomes clear that in all the other cases the glossator meant *lacnunge*, but only thought it necessary to write the first three letters. Another instance is *reð* 'ferocitas' Hpt. 476, which Leo, p. 407²⁷, registers as an independent word. We must of course read *reðnys*, which occurs, fully written out, Hpt. 448 and 450. The dictionaries (Hall, Sweet) give a *gedof* n. 'fury, madness,' based presumably on Hpt. 416 *deliramenta*=*gedofu*, but if we compare Hpt. 444 *deliramenta*=*dofunga*, which same gl. is repeated Hpt. 504 and also occurs W.W. 390³¹, also Hpt. 471 *machinamenta*=*dofunga*, it is obvious that Hpt. 416 must also be read *gedofunga*, as indeed Bouterwek read it, and that a neuter *gedof* is non-existent. Hpt. 513 there occurs the gl. *lautomiæ*=*tenys*, which Bouterwek not understanding makes into [*s*]*tenys*[*se*] and which, in its turn, is the authority for Hall's curious *steness* 'a prison.' And yet the matter is quite simple: *tenys* (= *tenes*) is the end of the gloss and the scribe meant *cweartenes* (= *-ernes*), as is clear from a gloss which occurs on the very same page, Hpt. 513, *lautomiæ*=*cweartenes*.

In the following instances the ghost-word is the result of a mere misreading of the MS. Thus in Leo 428¹⁸ we find a *welīc* 'wellenschlagend,' etc., with a reference to Hpt. 452, and Hall, p. 344, has the same word and reference, and translates 'surging.' On looking at Hpt. 452 we find *in fundo maris*=*on deopum oððe in welicum grunde sæwe*, for the *in welicum* of which the Oxford MS.¹ has the undoubtedly correct reading *niwelicum* (from *niwel*, *neowol*). Hall, p. 241, has *orwelīg* 'pure, chaste' taken from Assmann's *Angelsächsische Homilien*, p. 134⁶⁰⁸ *heo wære orwelges mægðhades*, but this is an obvious misreading for

¹ Cp. my O.E. Glosses I, 1942.

onwelges (from *onwealg*). The supposed *ced* 'a boat,' which Sweet rightly rejects, but which is to be found in Ettmüller, Leo, Bosworth-Toller, Hall, and, as *cæd*, even in the new edition of Paul's *Grundriss* I, 335, is a misreading for *ceol* presumably due to the *o* and *l* having been written too close together.¹

ARTHUR S. NAPIER.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY,
OXFORD, ENGLAND.

¹ The Oxford MS. (cp. my O.E. Gl. I, 28) certainly has *ceol*, though at first sight it might be taken for *ced* (with upright Latin d), the *o* and *l* being very close together, but on looking carefully one sees that *ceol* is undoubtedly meant. Moreover, if the scribe had intended to write *ced*, he would have used the sloping English *o*.